

around the country and throughout Minnesota to raise money to focus attention on breast cancer research. It goes all the way down to the younger and youth that are trying to bring attention to this issue.

I hope this month serves as a reminder of early detection and screening and working towards a cure for breast cancer.

I thank the gentlelady for giving me some time this evening and for her leadership.

AMERICA'S LONG-TERM STRATEGIC POSITIONING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss America's dependence on NATO, our relations with Russia, today's threat of radical Islam, and tomorrow's looming threat of an ever-more-powerful Communist China. In other words, tonight we will examine America's long-term strategic positioning in the world.

It is always valuable to look at history as well as the present before considering the future. So let's start with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It made sense, NATO made sense when it created it. It made sense to strengthen the NATO alliance during the 1950s while the Soviet Union was forming its Warsaw Pact and while the fall of China to Communist tyranny and the Korean war halted the vision of a peaceful world that we had been dreaming of in the aftermath of World War II. But in the 1950s, that was a threat.

But the 1950s are ancient history. The cold war is over. This is the 21st century. NATO no longer serves its purposes and is, in many ways, counterproductive. Ronald Reagan's visionary leadership, coupled with the unrelenting commitment and courage of the American people, brought an end to the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact. The people of Eastern Europe were freed from a hostile occupation and puppet Marxist governments. In the 1990s, the Russians dramatically moved away from domestic tyranny and away from a belligerent foreign policy.

Freed from its Soviet shackles, Russia expected to be embraced. At least if they weren't embraced, they certainly expected to be accepted as the Russians moved their troops out of occupied nations and opened up its political and economic system. It was perhaps the greatest peaceful resolution of a hostile confrontation between major global powers in history. NATO played an important role in bringing us to that point in the late 1980s and early 1990s.

The armed might of NATO deterred aggression and Soviet adventurism that could have resulted in a world conflict. NATO, with American leadership, won for Western civilization a

new chance at building a future of progress, freedom, and tranquility on a global scale.

□ 2130

In the last 20 years, there's been a change on a massive scale, most of it for good, in the former Soviet Union. Certainly, elements of this transition have been counterproductive and short of expectations and disappointing to the people of Russia, as well as peace-loving people in the West who had such high expectations. But by and large, enormous positive changes have taken place in Russia over these last 20 years.

It is in vogue now, in some circles, to suggest the current leadership in Russia is similar to the Communist thugger of those who not so long ago ruled that country with an iron fist and threatened world peace. Let this Cold Warrior shock you by suggesting that the Russian government's flaws, and they have many flaws, do not reflect a fundamental, malicious nature, as was the case under communism. And while there are examples of heavy-handedness, there is ample evidence of freedom of speech, religion and enterprise.

Within this context, the vilification of Russia by old Cold Warriors, my friends, most of them, has been unconscionable and unrelenting. The fall of communism, the restructuring of its society, and Russian forces, of course, withdrawing from Eastern Europe, this was breathtaking. These were breathtaking events. Clearly, the Russian people and the Russian government wanted to be part of the Western community if they were willing to take such dramatic steps. The door was open, and the Russians were not only willing but anxious to leave Cold War hostilities behind. They were naive and so were we about the transition. This historic opportunity has almost totally been squandered.

During the transition, rotten elements in the West allied themselves with nefarious Russian elites, and together they took advantage of their country's weakened and vulnerable condition. Russia was looted, and much of the loot ended up in Western banks. Vast natural resources ended up in the hands of a few power brokers. Billions of dollars of Russian wealth, basically mineral wealth, was transferred to private hands for a pittance.

The Russian people, rejected and isolated when they expected to be partners in building a new world, sunk into despair. Adding to their sense of helplessness, Russia was frozen out of the world market and relegated to the fringe market, like Iran. Let us note that today we are suffering because of that effort to isolate Russia from the global economy. I remember shortly after the Communists fell in Russia, I went to my own aerospace industry leaders and said, We've got to let the Russians compete with us. This is the one area, high technology, where they can compete. And of course, the reaction with our major aerospace companies was, no way.

And for 7 years after the fall of communism, Russia, which had invested enormous resources in rocket technology, was not permitted to sell their launch services to the West. That was the one area they could have really raised some hard currency, and we denied that to them.

While, at the same time, what did our friends in Europe do? Of course, Europe, by its very nature, the European Union is a cartel, excluding other countries like Russia. But instead of utilizing Russian missile and rocket technology to launch satellites, our European allies rushed forwards to spend hundreds, maybe \$150 billion, in developing their own launch capabilities. Again, instead of letting Russia be part of the world market, they were frozen out.

And how does this relate to Iran? Their scientists were earning \$50 a month, people with Ph.D.'s, the top level of their society, the cream of the scientific crop, starving, seeing their families suffering. They were looking around, so they were relegated to the fringe, and they went to Iran, and Iran agreed to hire them to build a nuclear reactor. I remember this very well. During the Clinton administration, I went to top people in the Clinton administration and explained, This will eventually be a horrible catastrophe, a threat, a huge threat to the United States and the West if we permit this nuclear power plant in Iran to be finished.

I said, but we shouldn't be threatening the Russians, which is what we did. Our government policy was, don't do it, or you're going to suffer, instead of saying, look, we know your people are unemployed. We'll get you a contract, financed by the World Bank. It wouldn't have cost us anything to build two power plants, maybe one in Turkey, maybe one in Malaysia, maybe one in another country that needed electric power. Instead, we just threatened them, and of course they had no other alternative. We didn't give them that alternative. And so now, we face this problem.

By the way, shortly after George W. Bush was elected, I went to see Condoleezza Rice. Made the same argument, We've got to act now—if we act now we can give the Russians an alternative in which they do not have to build this nuclear reactor for the Iranians. But let's give them the alternative.

Again, it was only threats and talk about punitive actions but no willingness to offer the Russians a positive alternative. So, of course they had to get their people employed. We're going to find out a lot about that in the months and years ahead as our own experts find themselves unemployed. And we care about them, just like the Russian people cared about their people. But we did not at that time reach out to help the Russians, and we are paying a price for that now.

It's important to look back at the end of the Cold War, and to recognize

the mistakes that have been made, and it has become clear that there were many, many mistakes that were made, by the Russians, yes, but also by us and our European allies. Now, however, is not the time to just lay blame. I didn't relate that story to blame the Clinton administration or the Bush administration or anyone else. But realizing what that mistake was, we now should move forward to try to see what we can do to make up for that and to try to establish better relations. This is not the time to place blame. Now is the time to set things right.

And as President Obama has said and Secretary of State Clinton has said, this is time to push the reset button with the Russians. And I would add, probably, yes, let's push the reset button with Russia and, at the same time, we should think about pulling the plug on NATO. So let's look at the future. Let's take actions today that will overcome past mistakes and look to a future when Russia and America, which share common challenges and common enemies, will be a source of strength to each other.

We have, over the last decade, inexplicably drifted toward a renewed adversarial relationship. Let us now take a serious look at what happens and recognize Russia to be an invaluable potential ally, an alliance that would be far more significant and viable than our current NATO alliance, which costs us far more than what NATO member states contribute to the international security operations and other type of activities that are vital to our country. Reagan gave us 2 decades of peace and prosperity because he did the right thing. The consequences of our actions since Reagan, however, are becoming more evident and more alarming each passing day.

We must have the wisdom, courage and political will to reconstruct our efforts rather than rely on diplomatic and military structures of the past. And let us note, Ronald Reagan did have the vision. I remember Ronald Reagan, I worked in the White House with Ronald Reagan. I remember him quite often making a stand on missile defense, which he believed in, but making it very clear to people that this wasn't something that should be seen by the Russians as a hostile move. Instead, he said that we should offer, if the Russians were willing to pull back their forces from their forward belligerent positions in Eastern Europe, that we should be willing to have missile defense as a joint project with the Russians. It would save us both money, and it would cover security for both of our countries.

Ronald Reagan believed in that. That was not rhetoric. That was something he thought we could do. Instead, what we have done is move forward with missile defense and put it on Russia's border, not as something in cooperation with the Russians, but instead, something that the Russians naturally view as a hostile act towards them.

Now, this is not the way we should go. Ronald Reagan understood that. Ronald Reagan stood firm, but he stood firm with a dictatorship in Russia, not with a Russia that was longing to be part of the Western world as it is today, and at least as it was 10 years ago.

We are confronted today with enormous foreign policy challenges and tasked with prevailing over those forces which will, if they can, destroy America and our way of life and murder our countrymen on a massive scale in the process. 9/11 was only a taste of the potential mayhem radical Islamists can and are willing to commit. By the way, we lost 3,000 civilians on 9/11, 3,000 people slaughtered before our eyes. That wasn't the intent. The intent was to murder everybody in those buildings and perhaps in all of the nearby buildings, as the World Trade Center buildings were going to collapse into a busy New York.

Yes, this was a plot to kill tens of thousands of Americans, and we'd better realize that that is the type of evil force we are up against. The national security threats before us are real and did not materialize out of thin air. But contrary to the dominant paradigm of our era, our ongoing relationship with NATO, since the end of the Cold War, has not worked to our benefit, nor has it made peace, stability, or our Nation's security more likely. NATO has recently engaged in a number of operations around the world, from fighting the Taliban to combating pirates. But whether one views these missions as relatively successful or a failure, one can hardly look at them and not realize that the cost of our continued involvement in NATO certainly outweighs the benefits.

In Afghanistan, the other 27 NATO countries sent a combined force of fewer than 5,000 troops, many in non-combatant positions. These 5,000 troops are there as part of a coalition. While a certain number of these fighters from our NATO partners are heroic, and we salute them and they are helpful, yes, and many of them do take risks, they are dwarfed in comparison to the number of American boots on the ground. 68,000 Americans serve in Afghanistan, and the number is rising. All of our allies in NATO: 5,000. And it has not escaped our attention that many of our NATO partners don't permit their troops to be placed where they might see combat.

So this contribution, while appreciated, in no way justifies the tens of billions of dollars that we pour into the NATO alliance. And now, as NATO expands to such countries as Albania, Croatia and Bulgaria, it raises other serious questions. One of the primary tenets of NATO and a NATO membership is that any member will come to the defense of another member if that member is being attacked. But realistically, is the United States going to come to the aid of these other countries at any time, these slew of small

countries, each of whom might have a border dispute with another country? And, is the reverse proposition, the reverse of that proposition worth the cost to us? Do we really need Albania and Croatia to come to our aid if we're attacked?

The answer is obviously, no. NATO's existence may be unnecessary for our interests. Let's also admit that NATO can be counterproductive. It's counterproductive to the peace at times. For example, by convincing the governments of new or potential member countries to aggressively and uncompromisingly deal with territorial disputes, we must realize that those disputes won't be settled by diplomatic negotiation.

The government of Georgia is a perfect example. The United States' discussion about NATO with the government of Georgia made it less willing to make compromises that were absolutely necessary for peace and stability in that region. Not only did Georgia not make the compromises, these talks about NATO emboldened them to take aggressive action. Breaking a 7-year truce with its regional adversaries, the Georgians launched a brash, ill-conceived military attack on the two breakaway provinces of Abkhazia and Ossetia. The Georgians started it. They attacked first. All the while, the people of the United States were told over and over again, using the most sinister words, that Russia was the aggressor. It was the Russians' fault. We heard that over and over again. "We are all Georgians today," Senator MCCAIN proclaimed.

Again and again we were told that Russia was doing something evil and villainous. However, in a detailed second look at what happened in Georgia, a recent NATO report confirmed that it was Georgian troops that broke the truce. It was the Georgian troops that started this fight and brought on the confrontation. The point is that the Georgian government was emboldened by talks with them about NATO.

□ 2145

They were the ones that broke the agreement that had kept the peace in that area after we talked to them about NATO. They invaded those two breakaway regions, which resulted in a considerable loss of life in Ossetia and Abkhazia, and it also brought on a counterattack from Russia, who had made agreements to maintain the peace with the people of Ossetia and Abkhazia. And the counterattack that was what? A reaction to the Georgian invasion. NATO's role was counterproductive, clearly.

Furthermore, do we believe that the American military forces should have been involved in that distant conflict? Should they have been involved as part of a NATO commitment to Georgia? My goodness, that doesn't make any sense to me. That's all the way across the world. Yes, it's in Russia's backyard so you know that they would be

very involved and interested. But the United States is going to engage in a military confrontation with a power like Russia over a dispute, territorial dispute, between Georgia and some regional governments that don't want to be part of Georgia?

By the way, the people of Georgia, I think they didn't have to be part of the Russian federation. I sympathize with their demand after the end of the Cold War to be an independent country. They have a right to self-determination. But so do the people of Abkhazia and Osetia. These two peoples had never been part of Georgia. Joseph Stalin, in his dictatorship, put them as part of Georgia.

Well, does it make sense for us to see our armed might in an agreement with the Georgian Government to make sure that we enforce their vision of what the world should look like?

It doesn't make sense also to sour a relationship with Russia, which is a country concerned, just as we would be in Mexico or Central America or in Canada. It doesn't make any sense to sour a relationship with Russia by implementing a NATO alliance with little countries all around it. In contrast, treating Russia as a friend would be enormously valuable to the security of both of our countries.

By expanding NATO with tiny countries and, of course, we are; these are countries that are right around Russia. How can that not look like we have a military alliance, which is what NATO is, threatening Russia? Of course, we would think same way.

Instead of an alliance with Russia, we are seeking an alliance with weaklings and Lilliputians rather than forging a strategic relationship with a giant. So if Georgia and the other countries like Albania and Croatia, countries that I'm very sympathetic with—and, as I say, I'm sympathetic with Georgia. I want it to be independent of Russia because that's what they want. But if they want to be in NATO, let's let them in. But if they're getting into NATO, we should be getting out. Because it is not in our interest to commit our military forces to battle all over the world in disputes that have nothing to do with our security or the overall global stability of the world.

I'm not suggesting, however, isolationism. That's what people say: oh, well, you're an isolationist. Nowhere am I suggesting that we should not have bilateral defense-related agreements. I certainly believe in involvement and in bilateral defense agreements as well as bilateral trade agreements.

At the outset of the Cold War we saw a clear and present threat in the Soviet Union, and we went to work strengthening our existing relationships with friendly countries and building new relationships with other countries. Well, we should do that today. We should create alliances, but we need to be realistic and honest in our assessment of

the challenges we face and the factors that are in play.

There are serious challenges to be overcome in the world today, and even more serious threats in the future. Radical Islam today, China soon. What we built to deter a Soviet invasion of Western Europe will not meet our needs of today. And I suggest that structure is, in many ways, counter-productive in dealing with today's threats.

In short, an alliance with Russia and a few other powerful nations is in our interest more than a continuance of an obsolete coalition or expanding that coalition to a large number of small countries.

Twenty years ago, I journeyed to Afghanistan. I stood alongside Afghan warriors, the mujahadeen, who were engaged in battle against the Soviet Army, which was then occupying their country. I was personally engaged in combat operations against Soviet troops during the Cold War. Very few people can say that.

My chest swelled with pride every time Ronald Reagan proclaimed our goal to be freedom for all subjugated people, including the Russian people. I was Ronald Reagan's speech writer, one of them, for 7 years. And when the President of the United States, Ronald Reagan, pleaded with Gorbachev to tear down the Wall, I was part of the team that broke through the foreign policy establishment's blockade that would have neutered that great historic statement even before Ronald Reagan gave it. And I cried with joy in retrospect when that wall finally came crashing down, hammered and chiseled down by freedom-loving people on both sides of that grotesquely evil barrier.

I despised the Soviet Union because I loved freedom, freedom for all people, including the Russian people. The Communist government in Russia was our worst enemy. Times have changed. We need the Russians as trusted allies, if not our best friends.

I recently visited Russia, and over dinner with a counterpart I explained, as I just did, that I had been his worst enemy during the Cold War, and he stopped me right in the middle of the sentence. No, no, you weren't the Russian people's worst enemy. You were the enemy of Communist tyranny. And thank God for that. That's what he said.

There are many Russians today that fully understand that they have left Communist tyranny behind, but when they look around them and look forward, they see hostility and they hear Russia vilified for acts of natural self-interest. How many times have we heard Russia vilified for charging the market price for its resources, namely, natural gas? Over and over again, as if charging the world price instead of subsidizing the price for the countries around it was a hostile act.

Would we be expected, our country be expected, to charge well below the market price to other countries for our

natural resources? Over and over again, Russia was described as committing a hostile act when it did that. And after all the reform, all the military and strategic withdrawals, that hasn't made any difference to us that Russia has done this.

We have kept them isolated and we have magnified every shortcoming that we could find in the new Russian Government. And all governments have shortcomings. Look, Turkey has human rights and democracy problems on par with Russia. In terms of the actual level of human rights problems, Turkey and Russia are probably at about the same level.

Yes, we should stay vigilant in our insistence on an accounting and correction of violation of human rights. And that's whether it's Russia or Turkey or any other country. But does anyone really want us to treat Turkey as a hostile power, try to make them into an enemy just because they do have imperfections? And are there some examples of heavy-handed use of power and some really questionable incidents there in Turkey? Well, yes, there are.

That doesn't mean we're going to turn them into our enemy and vilify everything they do. The Turkish people are wonderful people. They've been our friends for so long. But so are the Russians. The Russians are wonderful and creative people. They share many personal values with us: their sense of humor, love of children, of fun, of drink, and dance and, yes, their reverence for God and faith that was never beaten out of them by the decades that they suffered under atheistic communism.

There was openness and vulnerability of these people as the Soviet Communist system collapsed. They made mistakes and had societal and governmental problems, no doubt about it. All of those mistakes and all of these problems weren't all corrected. They needed support. They were vulnerable. And even as we applauded the implosion of the Communist Government, we did not do what was right by the Russian people. Even as they chaotically implemented massive changes and reforms, they were forced to, for example, forced to pay off the debt that was built up during the Communist dictatorship.

What country could develop with that huge millstone around their neck? In fact, how ironic it was. We went to the Russians and asked them to forgive the debt of Iraq that Saddam Hussein had run up when that dictatorship controlled Iraq. How ironic we went to the Russians to ask them to do what we had pressured policy not to permit them to do.

With that millstone around their neck of that debt, no wonder there was economic chaos. How could they have pulled together and averted such mass suffering with having to pay the entire debt of a dictatorship they did not vote for?

In the years since, we have been growing apart from Russia, into hostile

camps, even though our cooperation is paramount to the future of both of our countries. As I say, the Russians and the Americans share more than cultural traits. We now share some very real common threats. And those are radical Islam, which is upon us, and a totalitarian China, which is rapidly becoming a negative and tremendously powerful force in the world.

As we have continued to treat Russia as unworthy and with suspicion—even as they have reformed, we have done this—how is it that we have treated China, which has had no political reform, no liberalization, with such generosity?

The totalitarian Government of China is the world's worst human rights abuser. Those Chinese Communists in power in Beijing see us as their natural enemy. They unmistakably are also a threat to Russia. Yet, we still embrace that Chinese Government, the world's worst human rights abuser.

We fueled their economy, the Chinese economy. We have built their manufacturing base. We have enhanced their technological capabilities, even while simultaneously finding ways to continue hostility and noncooperation with Russia with one-way free trade policies with China and credits and investment in technology transfers. We have run up a massive trade deficit with China. A trillion dollars has shifted from the American economy into Chinese coffers, and all this while there hasn't been one opportunity for us to even get done the smallest bit of reform with our economic relationship with Russia. We weren't even able to bring ourselves to officially end the Jackson-Vanik restrictions which were placed on Russia during the Cold War—the Cold War, 30 or 40 years ago.

It is an insult and a sign of our own incompetence that we have not been able to lift the Jackson-Vanik restrictions on Russia, much less giving a reformed Russia a free trade agreement or Most Favored Nation status, which we bestowed upon the world's worst human rights abuser, China. Again, restrictions and hostility on Russia, all of this while we give China every benefit: Most Favored Nation status, tech transfers, capital investments.

Well, this relationship with Russia, as well as our relationship with China, has been wrongheaded, and gravely so. China, in stark contrast to the great changes in Russia, where there's been very visible political reform, where religion is not suppressed, where there are opposition political parties.

And, yes, there are imperfections in Russia and shortcomings and some heavy-handedness. But you go there and you hear talk radio shows complaining about the leadership in Russia. In Russia, you have opposition parties. There were two elections. And even the most critical of people who criticize Russia concede that those two major elections represented the inclination of the Russian people. Others

were on the ballot, but they weren't elected. They lost.

□ 2200

Well, there has been reform in Russia. And although it's far from perfect, great progress has been made, and it is evident. Otherwise, I would not suggest drawing closer to that country. There has been reform. That gives us a reason to try to work closer with them rather than holding them off.

But remember, while we hold them off and we treat them in a hostile way, there has been no political liberalization at all in China. We've let them profit from one-way free trade that has drained our financial resources and destroyed our manufacturing base even as we built their manufacturing base.

When President Obama spoke here a short time ago, he noted as of late, we've been losing 750,000 jobs a month. We've been losing 750,000 jobs a month, millions of jobs have been lost, and where did they go? They went to China, which is perfectly understandable when you look at our policies which created that type of outflow of capital and jobs as a small corporate elite—yeah, a very small corporate elite—benefited from this China trade and how it was structured.

But the American people lost, and it's going to get worse. Remember who has been paying for months and years now the price for the crazy policies that were not in the interest of our people in China. How did that come about? I've been in Congress now for 20 years. I was very proud to have led the floor fight with NANCY PELOSI on the other side of the aisle with me, leading the floor fight on that side of the aisle to oppose most favored nation status for China. Look back, find out who was behind most favored nation status for China. Who was it? It was during the Clinton administration that provided China should have permanent most favored nation status, so we didn't even get a chance to vote on it every year.

Now, it was a bipartisan betrayal of American interests here. Who was watching out for the American people? Instead, we established a trading system with China. I can tell you how it works. I represent the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. You go right down there, and you can see it. Of all the containers, the massive numbers of containers that come in every day, tens of thousands, 90 percent are coming in and only 10 percent are going out, and almost all the ones coming in are coming from China.

Well, China is not an economic partner. It's exploited us. It's taken advantage of our weaknesses. It's not a partner for peace nor is it a partner for world stability. China has no reform and has not made reform of its political structure, and it is, unfortunately, our most likely future enemy. Those words are very hard for me to say. They are not our enemy now. They are our adversary. But it is clear that unless there is a significant political re-

form in China, a liberalization of their system, a recognition of fundamental rights, the dictatorship will continue in power and grow stronger.

America's most likely future enemy we treat with special privileges. The Russians we treat like a pariah, even as they reach out to us even after they have had incredible reforms and restructuring in their country. China is already a deadly economic competitor of our people and is openly hostile to the basic values which make us Americans: a respect for human rights, religious freedom, the environmental stewardship that we have taken upon ourselves in recent years.

Our current relationship with China has resulted in an economic and security disaster for the United States of America. It is time to have the courage to admit this fact, and it is time to reverse poor decisions and bad policies. If the policies that have led us to this point are not reversed, the result will be national and, yes, global catastrophe. A world dominated by an authoritarian-controlled China will be a far different world than the one we live in today.

Again, we are talking about the Government of China, a specific regime, not the Chinese people themselves. The Chinese people are hardworking, family-oriented people. I have tremendous sympathy and respect for them. They are, in fact, freedom's greatest ally, our greatest hope, potentially our greatest friends who can help us avert a conflict between our countries.

The Chinese Government, however, is a loathsome tyranny, a dictatorship, a dictatorial clique that has enslaved their own population, intent not just in controlling China but also in dominating the rest of the planet. It is a government that, as I speak, is shooting down Muslim Uyghurs in East Turkistan, which is in the far regions of western provinces of China. Similarly, they are conducting a slow motion genocide on the people of Tibet. It's a government that arrests and murders Falun Gong religious practitioners.

And who are they? Who are the Falun Gong? Pay attention, America. Who are the Falun Gong? The Falun Gong want nothing more than religious freedom that they hold so dear. They are pacifists. What do they believe in? They believe in yoga and meditation. Yet thousands of them have been picked up by the Chinese Communist dictatorship and thrown into prisons, and oftentimes, they never come out of those prisons. And too often we find that what is coming out of those prisons—the prisons where the Falun Gong members have been deposited—what do we see coming out of those prisons? Body parts. Body parts sold to Americans and other people as organs to be transplanted; kidneys and other organs of the body that have been extracted from people who are put in jail for their religious convictions, and then they were murdered. That is the type

of ghoulish regime that now controls the country of China and the Chinese people.

In China, there are no unions, no workers' rights, no democratically elected environmental standards. There are no concerns about human rights or consideration for the inherent dignity of all humankind. There is no liberty, no independent judiciary, no freedom of the press, no rule of law, no opposition parties, no right to criticize the nature of their government or to criticize the clique that rules their country.

A billion people are being held in bondage so that goods can be manufactured cheaply in China in an unholy relationship between very wealthy American and western capitalists and the ghoulish dictators that control China. And with one-way free trade that we've established, to which we have acquiesced, and the short-term profit desired by America's corporate elite, our country has been a partner.

Considering those factors, our country has been a factor in building the Chinese economy into a monstrous threat while at the same time weakening and destroying our own manufacturing base. Millions of our people are being put out of work. We're going through a huge financial crisis.

One of the major elements that has brought us to this financial crisis has been a one-way free trade policy with Communist China. The fact that they now have \$1 trillion worth of our wealth and our manufacturing base has been destroyed should be of no surprise. It was predictable.

Those of us who fought most favored nation status and said we've got to have some political reform, liberalization before we give such enormous economic power to a government, we were just bypassed and treated as if we didn't matter because the business elite of our country wanted to have those massive short-term profits. Then they could give themselves bonuses, and they could retire here, leaving the stockholders and leaving their own employees far worse off in an intolerable situation, and now the whole country is in a horrible situation.

Over the last two decades, we have built China from a relatively backwards economy into a Frankenstein monster. When I say "we," I mean the policies of the United States Government have lifted the economic capabilities of a country that has had no political liberalization, no political reform of their dictatorial system, and a country, yes, that is also engaged in rebuilding its military.

Now this Frankenstein monster is slowly turning on its creator, turning on us. Well, there is a China-related issue that is emerging. Not all bad decisions were made in the past. We're about to make another bad decision by reversing one of the good decisions that we made that has really saved us from an incredible potential harm. The issue that is surfacing in Washington is

both symbolic and a very real threat to America's security and our economic viability. What is the issue? It is whether or not America should loosen its controls on the exports of our technology. The issue, which will be determined shortly, deals specifically with U.S. space technology, satellites, and Chinese rocketry.

About 15 years ago, the Clinton administration and American satellite manufacturers were permitted to launch their satellites on Chinese rockets. It was a position that they hadn't been permitted before. At the time, I talked to our aerospace industry. They thought it might be a good idea. This, of course, after being assured by the Clinton administration there would be no possibility of a technology transfer. Controls and security walls, I was promised, would prevent the Chinese from obtaining any space technology that had been paid for by the American taxpayers. Of course, American taxpayers had paid billions of dollars to develop space technology, like gyroscopes on a chip and all kinds of things that permitted rockets to be successful.

□ 2210

Well, I have to admit I accepted the Clinton administration's word. I swallowed it hook, line, and sinker. But within a very short period of time after that policy was opened up, I recognized the horrendous results of permitting that business relationship with Chinese rocket companies, which, I might add, those Chinese rocket companies then and are now owned by the People's Liberation Army. The Long March Rocket Company is a People's Liberation Army company. In short, American aerospace companies ended up perfecting Chinese rockets in order to send up our satellites at a cheaper rate.

By the way, what's the difference between a missile and a rocket? The difference between a missile and a rocket is the color of the paint on the outside of the projectile. So if it's in camouflage, it must be a missile, and if it's white or a different color, it must be a peaceful rocket.

In the end, after we were launching our satellites at that cheaper rate, in the end the viability of our own missile and rocket industry was undermined. Our own aerospace base, the base of our economy, our aerospace jobs and expertise were put in jeopardy. And at the same time we improved the Chinese rockets and missiles, we improved their ability to launch military as well as civilian payloads. Our transfer of technology and know-how thus enabled the People's Liberation Army rockets to carry more than one nuclear warhead. They couldn't do that before. Our technology. Our people went over there, and now they have the technology of having three warheads instead of one warhead, which means obliterating all of southern California instead of one part of southern California. We provided them the ability to MERVE. That's what it's called.

It was insane then, but now the issue is coming back. And without even blushing, the China lobby, the Big Business community that has been making all kinds of money off the China trade even as it has hurt our own economy, are pushing for us to open up the China rocket industry again.

To make this clear, I am part of the team that is trying to move forward legislation to permit our high-tech industries to export to and to cooperate with friendly democratic countries. I believe in free trade between free people. But I have personally insisted on legislation opening up that free trade with free countries, and we have worked with other Members of Congress to ensure that this tech trade legislation will not loosen the restrictions on using Chinese rockets to launch American satellites. We know that launching American satellites on Chinese rockets will result in technology transfer and the upgrading of those Chinese rockets. It happened before; it will happen again. If we open up to the use of Chinese rockets, it helps them and it hurts us.

What will it do to our aerospace industry, like Boeing and Northrop Grumman, who are already hard pressed in the production of their own rockets and missiles? How about Sealaunch, a Boeing partnership with the Ukraine which launches things into space from a floating platform which is based in southern California?

Well, it recently declared bankruptcy, but if we allow the Chinese to undercut everybody's price, it will be permanently out of business. It will be permanently out of business, of course, if the People's Liberation Army is permitted to sell rocket launchers on the cheap until all of our companies go bankrupt. Space X and other entrepreneurial U.S. space transportation companies that have invested hundreds of millions of dollars of private capital in creating a private U.S. launch industry will be mortally wounded if we permit the Chinese to come in with their subsidized system and their controlled economy and undercut the price until our guys go out of business. And then, of course, they'll be in complete control of what gets into space.

The whole debate on this issue and the maneuvering on Capitol Hill reflects an insidious manipulation of our system by a foreign power and, yes, the total absence of any type of moral consideration or patriotic consideration on the part of America's financial and corporate elite. They have had one-way free trade and a multitude of economic building concessions, and it has been American policy to give it to them.

Over the years we have been told over and over again to justify such a power that we were giving this monstrous regime, and we were saying, if we just get involved with them, let's get more involved with these people, let's uplift the economy of the Chinese people, and their government will come around. By making their country more

profitable and making sure their country is more prosperous, we will actually bring forces about that will liberalize that country. That's what we were told all this time. And has that happened? There has been no liberalization in China.

I call this theory that's been foisted upon us by America's economic elite, which are making profit from that tuggery and that dictatorship and the control of the Chinese people—yes, those people gave us that ideal, that if we just keep going, keep making China more prosperous, they will come around and become more peaceful—I call that the “Hug a Nazi, Make a Liberal” theory, and obviously it has not worked.

So why have we had this bad policy? I would draw the people's attention to this. They are unapologetically trying to implement the same policy that failed 15 years ago, the same policy that was a tremendous detriment not only to our economy and to our high-tech industry but to the security of our country. These same forces now are trying to make sure that the legislation going through Congress takes out the language that I and other congressmen have put in it to make sure that we do not loosen the restrictions that we have on American satellites being used in Chinese rockets for launch.

By the way, what we see in Washington today is perhaps, as I say, some of the most insidious examples of some of our own weaknesses. What we've got here is tens of millions of dollars being pumped in by China and some very elite financial interests in our country to lobby Congress to try to change the rules of the game so that what was so severely damaging to us 15 years ago, as we improved Chinese rockets, which are now capable of launching nuclear weapons into our cities, because of what we did for them, they want to go back to those policies which nobody can deny will most likely result in even more improving the Chinese rocket system and the destruction of America's own homegrown rocket and missile industry.

Yet our corporate elites have enormous influence on policy. They have hired the best lobbyists in town, former Members of Congress, former Members of the Senate, people who have been inside and outside of government. These people have signed on. One Senator who was high up in the committees overseeing the Department of Defense, overseeing the security of our country, who opposed permitting Chinese rockets to launch American satellites over the years, now has been hired by the Chinese. To do what? To make sure that the rules and the regulations restricting that are lifted so that they can accomplish what he was opposing.

It doesn't get any lower than that, does it? Americans willing to accept large financial gains for themselves even as they put the rest of us and their children's children in jeopardy.

Today this isn't going to be turned around unless we have the courage to make some very strong choices and tough choices. One is to make sure that we call those people to task that are willing to sell out the long-term interests of their country for the almighty buck, and especially when that buck is coming from the world's worst human rights abuser.

□ 2220

And then finally we need the courage to walk away from the past and try to restructure our position in the world. We need to make friends and make sure that Russia is our friend because China and that radical Islam threaten both of us. There are other countries in the world that share our values and share this common threat: Russia, India—and how about Japan? Japan, which has been targeted by China, and they know they're targeted by China.

An alliance between the United States, Russia, India, and Japan would soon be joined by most of the other free countries of the world. This is a type of relationship that will bring about a more peaceful world.

And if we are going to succeed and our country is to be prosperous, if we're going to turn around this economic crisis, we have to have a long-run view, and we can't leave the decisionmaking of policies up to the financial elite in our country that only has short-term profit in mind. That is our biggest vulnerability, and the Chinese have played us like a fiddle. They know that the American corporate leaders have no loyalty to the long-term interests of the United States of America.

We must make the policy, and we cannot let China and this business elite manipulate these votes in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States so that policies are put in place that will not serve our interest.

We have not been diligent in the past, and that is why we are suffering today. We are suffering because of bad judgment, but also because the American people expected us to stand up and fight and we did not. We instead let these powerful interests run all over us.

And as I say, this is a bipartisan talk. I remember NANCY PELOSI here, and DANA ROHRBACHER here, I remember BARNEY FRANK there, and Chris Cox over here fighting Most Favored Nation Status for China, saying that we would regret the day when these economic policies come back and hurt our country, and they have come back and hurt us dramatically.

And they are now moving on our satellite and our rocket industry to make us even more vulnerable and to take away even those advantages, that technology advantage that we have.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the American people and my colleagues pay close attention to the overwhelmingly financed, heavily financed lobbying campaign that is going to try to

change the rules that are now protecting our launch rocket and missile launch industries from being destroyed by cheap Chinese rockets that will in the end destroy our industry. And only then when they have us at their mercy will we feel the repercussions of the decisions we're making and the repercussions of allowing the financial elite with short-term profit in mind to make the policies for the United States of America.

America, we are the only hope in the world. We must stand strong. Democracy works if we work at it. We must stand together, and this has been the way it has been for 250 years. There would be no hope for anyone in the world today or in the past 150 years who longed for freedom, who suffered under tyranny. They would have no hope except for the courage and conviction of the United States of America. We marched out and defeated Japanese militarism and communism. We fought the Nazis.

Well, since the end of the Cold War, we've made some very bad mistakes after the fall of communism. Let's look at our decisions. Let's have the courage to recognize some bad decisions, correct them; and let's create a new alliance in this world that will serve the interest of peace, prosperity, and freedom for our people and all the peoples of the world.

RESTORING JOB CREATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, this evening I come to the floor to talk about a very important issue both to our efforts to restore job creation in America and to our national security, and that is the ongoing efforts to replace our air tankers in the U.S. Air Force fleet, which are so vital to our national security, that form the backbone of our Air Force fleet, and everyone knows that our military security depends on our dominant Air Force, air cover for operations. And the ability to have that depends on having a very robust air tanker fleet to provide fuel for our jets in the air.

We now obviously need a new tanker because we relied upon the KC-135 now for decades, and they are now reaching the end of their work life, and we need to replace them for air tankers. But, Mr. Speaker, we have a real problem right now in that the proposal on how to do that is seriously unfair to American workers and seriously jeopardizes our national security interest in maintaining a very strong industrial base to be able to manufacture these aircraft.

What has happened to date is that the U.S. Air Force in its third effort to replace these air tankers with a contract has issued a request asking for proposals to provide air tankers to the